

From: [PETERSON Jenn L](#)
To: [Chris Thompson](#); [Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Jeremy Buck](#); [kathleenfeehan@ctuir.com](#); [Robert Gensemer](#); [Robert Neely](#); [Ron.gouguet@noaa.gov](#); [Stan Van De Wetering](#)
Cc: [Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [Valerie Lee](#)
Subject: RE: Draft Round 3 lamprey and sturgeon data needs doc
Date: 02/16/2006 06:15 PM

I have some comments on this - mostly related to the lamprey studies. While we did agree on conducting studies on juvenile lamprey, unfortunately we weren't able to have a good technical discussion that would refine them. I have started to write up comments, but won't likely finish by tomorrow (I am going out of town). I hope to get comments out next week.

-Jennifer

-----Original Message-----
From: Chris Thompson [mailto:chris.thompson@eilttd.net]
Sent: Wed 2/15/2006 11:16 AM
To: Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON Jenn L; Jeremy Buck; kathleenfeehan@ctuir.com; Robert Gensemer; Robert Neely; Ron.gouguet@noaa.gov; Stan Van De Wetering
Cc: blischke.eric@epamail.epa.gov; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov; Valerie Lee
Subject: Draft Round 3 lamprey and sturgeon data needs doc

Hi Joe, Rob, Bob, Jeremy and Jenn,

Attached is a draft summary of my understanding of what we agreed to during our (1) conference call last Friday regarding sampling design issues for prebreeding sturgeon, and (2) meeting in Portland last Monday regarding lamprey studies for Round 3. The Sturgeon summary that I sent you all yesterday has been included in, and therefore superceded by, the attached document.

Joe - you called this morning to ask about the status of the attached summary because you are concerned about the feasibility of including language regarding lamprey (and sturgeon?) in the 17 February directive to the LWG. I agree that there must be agreement among EPA and its trustees about the language that goes into the document. Therefore, we all must review and agree to the attached document before EPA includes it, in some form, in their directive to the LWG. However, I think the document is extremely provides sufficient detail regarding lamprey and sturgeon data needs to enable the LWG to begin to assess the amount of funding necessary to conduct the studies, while simultaneously being sufficiently vague that we have a free hand to further develop details regarding methodology, experimental design, etc.

So, I strongly advocate that we try to review and accept the attached document in its current or some revised form by the COB today or tomorrow at the latest so that language from this document can be included, in some form, in the direction to the LWG on 17 February rather than at a later date.

Let me know your thoughts if you get a chance.

Best,

Chris

--
THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS LEGALLY PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF THE PERSONS OR ENTITIES NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT SUCH PERSONS OR ENTITIES, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION, DISSEMINATION OR REPRODUCTION OF THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY CALL US AT 206-525-3362.

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE USE OF PERSONS OR ENTITIES NAMED ABOVE. IF YOU ARE NOT SUCH PERSONS OR ENTITIES, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISTRIBUTION, DISSEMINATION OR REPRODUCTION OF THIS E-MAIL MESSAGE IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS MESSAGE IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY CALL US AT 206-525-3362.

<<Round 3 proposed lamprey and sturgeon studies.doc>>